

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

JUAN A. PORTILLO,

Petitioner,

V.

VICTOR M. ALMAGER, Warden,

Respondent.

Civil No. 08-0706 LAB (JMA)

ORDER DISMISSING CASE WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has submitted a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

FAILURE TO ALLEGGE EXHAUSTION OF STATE JUDICIAL REMEDIES

Habeas petitioners who wish to challenge either their state court conviction or the length of their confinement in state prison, must first exhaust state judicial remedies. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b), (c); Granberry v. Greer, 481 U.S. 129, 133-34 (1987). To exhaust state judicial remedies, a California state prisoner must present the California Supreme Court with a fair opportunity to rule on the merits of every issue raised in his or her federal habeas petition. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b), (c); Granberry, 481 U.S. at 133-34. Moreover, to properly exhaust state court remedies a petitioner must allege, in state court, how one or more of his or her federal rights have been violated. The Supreme Court in Duncan v. Henry, 513 U.S. 364 (1995) reasoned: “If state courts are to be given the opportunity to correct alleged violations of prisoners’ federal rights, they must surely be alerted to the fact that the prisoners are asserting claims under the United States Constitution.” Id. at 365-66 (emphasis added). For example, “[i]f a habeas

1 petitioner wishes to claim that an evidentiary ruling at a state court trial denied him [or her] the due
 2 process of law guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment, he [or she] must say so, not only in federal
 3 court, but in state court.” Id. at 366 (emphasis added).

4 Nowhere on the Petition does Petitioner allege that he raised his claim in the California Supreme
 5 Court. In fact, he specifically indicates he did not seek review in the California Supreme Court. (See
 6 Pet. at 6.) If Petitioner has raised his claim in the California Supreme Court he must so specify. “The
 7 burden of proving that a claim has been exhausted lies with the petitioner.” Matthews v. Evatt, 105 F.3d
 8 907, 911 (4th Cir. 1997); see Breard v. Pruett, 134 F.3d 615, 619 (4th Cir. 1998); Lambert v. Blackwell,
 9 134 F.3d 506, 513 (3d Cir. 1997); Oyler v. Allenbrand, 23 F.3d 292, 300 (10th Cir. 1994); Rust v. Zent,
 10 17 F.3d 155, 160 (6th Cir. 1994).

11 Further, the Court cautions Petitioner that under the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty
 12 Act of 1996 (AEDPA) a one-year period of limitation shall apply to a petition for a writ of habeas corpus
 13 by a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court. The limitation period shall run from
 14 the latest of:

15 (A) the date on which the judgment became final by the
 16 conclusion of direct review or the expiration of the time for seeking such
 17 review;

18 (B) the date on which the impediment to filing an application
 19 created by State action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the
 20 United States is removed, if the applicant was prevented from filing by
 21 such State action;

22 (C) the date on which the constitutional right asserted was initially
 23 recognized by the Supreme Court, if the right has been newly recognized
 24 by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on
 25 collateral review; or

26 (D) the date on which the factual predicate of the claim or claims
 27 presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due
 28 diligence.

29 28 U.S.C.A. § 2244(d)(1)(A)-(D) (West Supp. 2002).

30 The statute of limitations does not run while a properly filed state habeas corpus petition is
 31 pending. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(2); see Nino v. Galaza, 183 F.3d 1003, 1006 (9th Cir. 1999). But see
 32 Artuz v. Bennett, 531 U.S. 4, 8 (2000) (holding that “an application is ‘properly filed’ when its delivery
 33 and acceptance [by the appropriate court officer for placement into the record] are in compliance with

the applicable laws and rules governing filings.”). However, absent some other basis for tolling, the statute of limitations does run while a federal habeas petition is pending. Duncan v. Walker, 533 U.S. 167, 181-82 (2001).

4 Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases provides for summary dismissal of a habeas
5 petition “[i]f it plainly appears from the face of the petition and any exhibits annexed to it that the
6 petitioner is not entitled to relief in the district court . . .” Rule 4, 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254. Here, it
7 appears plain from the Petition that Petitioner is not presently entitled to federal habeas relief because
8 he has not alleged exhaustion of state court remedies.

CONCLUSION AND ORDER

10 Accordingly, the Court **DISMISSES** the Petition without prejudice and with leave to amend for
11 Petitioner's failure to allege exhaustion as to state judicial remedies. If Petitioner wishes to proceed
12 with this case, he must submit, **no later than June 25, 2008**, a copy of this Order and a First
13 Amended Petition which remedies the deficiencies noted above. **The Clerk of the Court is**
14 **directed to mail Petitioner a blank First Amended Petition form.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 || DATED: April 30, 2008

Larry A. Bunner

HONORABLE LARRY ALAN BURNS
United States District Judge